UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,464	11/12/2003	David G. Kuehr-McLaren	RSW920010117US1	6754
46270 7590 10/31/2008 (SAUL-RSW) PATENT DOCKETING CLERK IBM Corporation (SAUL-RSW) C/O Saul Ewing LLP			EXAMINER	
			DUNHAM, JASON B	
Penn National Insurance Tower 2 North Second Street, 7th Floor Harrisburg, PA 17101		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3625		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/31/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/706,464	KUEHR-MCLAREN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	JASON B. DUNHAM	3625				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 Se	eptember 2008.					
	action is non-final.					
·=						
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	•					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate				
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application				

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 was filed in this application after a decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, but before the filing of a Notice of Appeal to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or the commencement of a civil action. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the appeal has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114 and prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on September 29, 2008 has been entered. Applicant amended claims 1, 5, and 9. Claims 1-12 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Epling (US 2005/0091101) in view of Barzilai (US 2002/0029201).

Referring to claim 1. Epling discloses a computer implemented method for conducting electronic commerce transactions among participants in an E-marketplace, comprising the steps of:

obtaining privacy-use information for each participant and inputting said information into a computer (paragraph 27 & figure 1);

comparing, using said computer, the privacy use information for each participant to determine matches (figure 2);

Epling further discusses stopping any transactions before they occur if the privacy use information does not match but does not explicitly disclose prohibiting transactions from occurring unless participants have matching privacy information. Barzilai discloses a computer implemented method of conducting electronic commerce transactions among participants in a marketplace using said computer, prohibiting any transactions from occurring between participants unless the participants have matching privacy use information (Barzilai: abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have modified the method of Epling to have included prohibiting transactions from occurring unless participants have matching privacy information, as taught by Barzilai, in order to control the exchange of information between parties and provide information between parties only when the privacy policies are found to be compatible (Barzilai: abstract).

Referring to claim 2. The combination of Epling and Barzilai further discusses a method wherein said obtaining step comprises at least the step of requiring each participant in the E-marketplace to present to the E-marketplace their P3P policy (Epling: paragraph 9 & figure 2).

Referring to claim 3. The combination of Epling and Barzilai further discloses a method wherein said obtaining step comprises at least the steps of:

Application/Control Number: 10/706,464 Page 4

Art Unit: 3625

 Presenting each participant with questions that elicit their privacy-use information (paragraph 27); and

 Storing the elicited privacy-use information for use in said comparing step (Epling: paragraph 29).

Referring to claim 4. The combination of Epling and Barzilai further discloses a method wherein said privacy-use information includes at least one of: use information pertaining to elicited e-mail addresses; use information pertaining to financial; use of personal information; use of business information, and the delivery of advertising to the participant (Epling: paragraph 18).

Referring to claims 5-8. System claims 5-8 are rejected under the same rationale as set forth above in the rejection of method claims 1-4 containing similar limitations. See also figure 4 of Epling.

Referring to claims 9-12. Medium claims 9-12 are rejected under the same rationale as set forth above in the rejection of method claims 1-4 containing similar limitations. See also figure 4 and paragraph 61 of Epling.

Response to Argument

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 3625

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JASON B. DUNHAM whose telephone number is (571)272-8109. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Smith can be reached on 571-272-6763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jason Dunham/ Patent Examiner 10/17/08